DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 161 EA 013 896

AUTHOR Hansot, Elisabeth; Tyack, David
TITLE The Dream Deferred: A Golden Age for Women School Administrators.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO IFG-PP-81-C2
PUB DATE May 81
GRANT OB-NIE-G-80-0111
NOTE 50p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, CERAS Bldg., Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305 ($1.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Administrators; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Opportunities; *Females; Retrenchment; *School Administration; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Stereotypes; Social Change

ABSTRACT

Despite contrary predictions, men have retained their near-monopoly of top positions in educational administration and have even replaced women where they had gained a toehold, as in elementary principalships. The pattern in education follows that in many complex white-collar organizations; horizontal and vertical segregation of male and female jobs systematically limits opportunities for women, with the result that women form the bulk of the work force and men serve as bosses. This situation can be explained by the character of organizations and their shaping of the behavior of members and by male hegemony in society as a whole. In school administration, men are most likely to be found in positions with the greatest power, pay, and prestige and in jobs requiring supervision of other males. As teaching principalships declined in elementary schools, for example, and became full-time administrative positions, the percentage of women principals declined markedly. Current educational retrenchment bodes ill for prospective women administrators. Males will probably hold on to their present positions and new openings will be more restricted. Bringing about lasting change will require persistent effort at the individual, organizational, and broader social levels. (Author/WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207161

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 013 896

Policy Paper No. 81-C2

THE DREAM DEFERRED: A GOLDEN AGE FOR WOMEN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Elisabeth Hansot and David Tyack*

May 1981

*Dr. Hansot is a Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Nevada, Reno. Dr. Tyack is a Professor in the School of Education and the History Department at Stanford University.

The research for this report was supported by funds from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. OB-NIE-G-80-0111). The analyses and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of this organization.

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL
FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance is a Research and Development Center of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and is authorized and funded under authority of Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act as amended by Section 403 of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford (CERAS).

The research activity of the Institute is divided into the following program areas: Finance and Economics; Politics; Law; Organizations; and History. In addition, there are a number of other projects and programs in the finance and governance area that are sponsored by private foundations and government agencies which are outside of the special R&D Center relationship with NIE.

Abstract

In 1909 Ella Flagg Young, Superintendent of Schools in Chicago, predicted that women would soon predominate in school administration. This study examines the grounds for Young's optimism and why her prediction proved to be so wrong. After a short-term increase of women in certain administrative positions--especially as state and county superintendents--men not only retained their near-monopoly of top positions but replaced women where they had gained a toe-hold, as in elementary principalships. The authors maintain that men were most likely to be found in positions where the pay, power and prestige were greatest; where administrators supervised males; where administrators interacted with influential members of the community (as in superintendencies and high school principalships); and where their work was considered more "managerial" than "instructional." The study analyzes how males maintained their hegemony and explores possible means of achieving greater equity today.

In 1909 Ella Flagg Young, superintendent of schools in Chicago and soon to become the first woman president of the National Education Association, made a confident prediction. "Women are destined to rule the schools of every city," she said. "I look for a majority of big cities to follow the lead of Chicago in choosing a woman for superintendent. In the near future we shall have more women than men in executive charge of the vast educational system. It is woman's natural field and she is no longer satisfied to do the larger part of the work and yet be denied the leadership."[1] A brilliant scholar and cautious observer and commentator, Young was not given to grandiloquent gestures. Why was she so hopeful? Why was her prediction to prove so wrong? To ask why men have dominated management in public education--the largest single source of professional jobs for women--may uncover clues to the sexual structuring of work throughout public administration.

At the time Young spoke, the facts of unequal opportunity for female administrators in public schools were apparent. Young herself was an anomaly; almost all city superintendents were men, and she was the first woman to head a big city school system. Although women predominated as teachers--the pool from which administrators were drawn--they held nowhere near a proportionate number of leadership positions. Several decades later the situation was even worse for women. Table 1 compares the figures for 1905 in cities over 8,000 population with nationwide statistics for 1972-73 (the two sets of statistics

TABLE 1

Percentage of Professional Public School Employees Who Were Women, 1905 and 1972-73

	1905	1972-73
Elementary School Teachers	97.9	84.0
Elementary School Principals	61.7	19.6
High School Teachers	64.2	46.0
High School Principals (Senior High)	5.7	1.4
District Superintendents	--	0.1

Sources:
1905: National Education Association, Report of the Committee on Salaries, Tenure, and Pensions of Public School Teachers in the United States to the National Council of Education, July, 1905 (Winona, Minn.: NEA, 1905), 52.

1972-73: Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker, "Women in Educational Governance: A Statistical Portrait," Educational Researcher, 3 (July-August, 1974), 5-6.

are roughly comparable because of the massive consolidation of districts that had taken place by the latter date, when only about 13 percent of pupils attended schools with fewer than 1,800 pupils).[2]

Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker have documented how serious were the sexual disparities in educational governance in the mid-1970s. "While 19% of all men in elementary education and 8% of all men in secondary education are principals," they note, "only 1% of all women in elementary education and .4% of all women in secondary education are principals." Women administrators also earned substantially less than men; in 1970 male administrators earned an average of $13,625, while women received about $5,000 less. In the last generation the number of women in policy-making positions in state departments of education declined. In the United States Office of Education women constituted 59 percent of employees in 1974 but only 23 percent of those at or above the GS-13 grade. Even in a newly created agency, the National Institute of Education, the average civil service rank of women was GS-8 and of men GS-12.[3]

Table 2, compiled by Suzanne Estler, illustrates that such sexual inequities in educational administration reflect male dominance in most other important arenas of decision-making in private as well as public administration.[4]

These figures reveal the systematic limitation of opportunities for women in American society by gender. The pattern appears in many complex white-collar organizations where women are a majority of the workers while men are the bosses, such as in public bureaucracies, libraries, department stores, hospitals, and

TABLE 2

Women in Decision Making: Representative Data

Position	Total Number	Number of Women	Percent of Women	Year	Source
Corporations					
Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (Fortune 500 firms)	500	1	.2	1976	1
Directors	*	ca. 200	*	1975	2
Unions					
President, National Unions	177	2	1.1	1972	3
Higher Education					
President (4-year Institutions)	953	32	3.4	1971-72	4
Exec. Vice President (4-year Institutions)	217	5	2.4	1971-72	4
CEO (2-year Institutions)	523	3	.6	1971-72	4
Elementary and Secondary Education					
Superintendent	14,379	90	.6	1970-71	5
High School Principal	13,763	414	3.0	1970-71	5
Junior High Principal	8.782	310	3.5	1970-71	5
Elementary Principal (Includes teaching Principals)	47,714	10,041	21.0	1970-71	5
Mumbers, School Boards ca.	96,560	11,000	11.4	1975-76	6
Federal Government					
Cabinet Officers	11	2	18.2	1977	
Civil Service: GS 18 and above	1,837	24	1.3	1970	7
Politics					
Federal:					
U.S. Senate	100	0	0.0	1977	8
U.S. House of Representatives	435	18	4.1	1977	8
Supreme Court Justices	9	0	0.0	1977	
Federal Judges	675	8	1.2	1975	9
State:					
Governor	50	2	4.0	1977	8
Secretary of State	50	12	24.0	1977	8
Treasurer	50	2	4.0	1977	8
Lt. Governor	50	3	6.0	1975	9
Senate	1,978	102	5.2	1977	8
House of Representatives	5,583	583	10.4	1977	8
Non-Profit Organizations					
**Board Members	2,794	636	22.8	1975-76	10
**Board Officers	474	90	19.0	1975-76	10
**Executive Directors	94	21	22.3	1975-76	10
Foundation Trustees	3,476	664	19.1	1976	11

*Data not available

**Greater Boston Area, excludes Foundations

TABLE 2 (continued)

Sources:

1. Bruck, Charles G. "A Group Profile of the Fortune 500 Chief Executive." Fortune, Vol. 93, No. 5, May, 1976, pp. 173-177, 308-312.

2. Business and Society Review, "Who are the Women in the Board Room?" No. 16, Winter, 1975-76, pp. 5-10.

3. Berquist, Virginia. "Women's Participation in Labor Organizations," Monthly Labor Review, October, 1974, pp. 3-9.

4. National Education Association. The Status of Women Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education Institutions, 1971-72, 1973.

5. "Professional Women in Public Schools, 1970-71." N.E.A. Research Bulletin, Vol. 49, No. 3, October, 1971, pp. 67-68.

6. Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Women in 1975. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1966, p. 44.

7. U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Manpower Information Systems. A Study of the Employment of Women in the Federal Government. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, Pham. SM 62-06, Dec., 1971, p. 17.

8. National Women's Education Fund, Press Releases, October, November, 1976.

9. Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Women in 1975, p. 44.

10. Loeser, Herta and Wilcox, Karen. "Special Project--Women on Governing Boards of Non-Profit Organizations." (Unpublished paper for the Alliance for Volunteerism, Task Force on Women and Citizen Participation.) Boston: Clearing House Inc., Sept. 24, 1976.

11. Marting, Leeds. "Women and Foundations: What We Now Know. . . What We Want to Do." Unpublished paper prepared for the Planning Committee for Women and Foundations, 1976, p. 1.

schools. The limitation of opportunities by sex occurs in two primary ways in such institutions: a horizontal form of segregation into sex-typed jobs; and a vertical form of segregation in which men dominate the upper layers of hierarchies. Often, as in public schools, both forms of segregation are present. Although there are differences between organizations--and we shall return to these later in our analysis--there are enough similarities that a case study of the public schools as one form of bureaucracy can illuminate the dynamics of unequal opportunity.[5]

What do we mean by the systematic limitation of opportunities for women? We see gender as a fundamental ordering principle in society, comparable to race or class in the pervasive ways it shapes life chances, attitudes, and behavior. To know a baby's sex--like the race or class of parents--is already to narrow the range of predictions one might plausibly make about that child's future. This is not to claim determinism of some "anatomy is destiny" variety but simply to assert that the probable opportunities of that child are largely affected by gender. If she is female, her chances in later life are different from those of males. We do not believe that the differences in opportunities open to males and females stem only from different socialization to "sex roles" any more than the life chances of whites and blacks arise simply from conditioning to "race roles" or class differences from "class roles." Those disparities are embedded in the culture and economy and polity of the larger male-dominated society, and they are visible in the structure and functioning of most complex organizations.[6]

How can one explain inequities by sex? We suggest that there have been three major approaches. The first, and by far the most common in the literature, uses the individual man or woman as the unit of analysis and psychology as the

root discipline. It focuses attention on early socialization of children to distinct "sex roles" and the persistent importance of such sex stereotypes in later attitudes and behavior. To remedy inequities the advocates of this approach tend to favor compensatory resocialization of women so that they will perform better in new roles--to become more assertive, to learn a new script--and so that men will learn to adopt less discriminatory attitudes. Some commentators urge both women and men to become more androgynous in beliefs and actions.[7]

A second approach, one favored especially by organizational sociologists like Rosabeth Kanter, concentrates on the character of organizations and how they shape the behavior of members. The chief source of male hegemony lies not in the psychological makeup of individuals, they assert, but in the structure and operation of organizations. Women behave in self-limiting ways not because they were socialized as females but because they are locked into low-power, low-visibility, dead-end jobs. If, like children, they hope that superiors will--like tooth fairies--discover them, it is because they are indeed the dependents of powerful males. Remedying that situation requires the restructuring of opportunity so that women can have a chance to demonstrate and develop their competence. It requires the elimination of barriers to advancement that favor males, and the hiring of women in sufficient numbers to cure the pathologies associated with token representation.[8]

A third approach looks beyond individuals and separate organizations to male hegemony in the society as a whole. This style of interpretation, which analyzes the broader culture and political economy, appears in the work of radical feminists and social scientists interested in the societal distribution of power. It emphasizes the need for consciousness-raising, mobilization of

women, and coalitions pressing for legal and political changes. It envisages fundamental social transformation as prerequisite to meaningful change.[9]

We favor the second and third approaches since we fear that efforts to resocialize individual women may produce more frustration than achievement if such reforms do not recognize how profoundly gender influences almost all aspects of human experience. We see the need to combine the organizational and societal perspectives, into one. Institutions exist in communities that influence them in myriad ways yet they are too often studies in isolation. The broader social context, however, is more nuanced than the "patriarchy" denounced in some polemical works. By concentrating on a single organizational system--the public schools--and by posing questions about its relation to the larger culture and political economy, we hope to contribute to understanding inequality in America.

Over the last hundred years we find a distinct pattern of male hegemony in school administration. First, men were likely to be found in administrative positions in education where power, pay, and prestige were greatest. Second, men predominated in positions where the job required supervising other males, while women were more likely to be found in roles where they dealt mostly with other women and with children; men generally did not want women as bosses. Third, men were sought for positions like superintendent and high school principal that linked the educational system with its external environment--where maleness gave the schools a higher social credit rating because of the higher general standing of men in society; women, by contrast, were more likely to occupy administrative positions that looked inward toward the system. Fourth, men displaced women in work that came to be defined as "managerial" rather than primarily instructional. As the number of "teaching principals" declined in elementary schools, for example, and the job became a full-time

administrative position, the percentage of women declined markedly.

In exploring the genesis and meaning of this pattern we begin by asking why astute observers like Ella Flagg Young were optimistic in the early twentieth century about the possibility of educational leadership by women. We then examine the administrative jobs women actually held--and lost. In the next section we look at how men remained dominant in school administration. Finally we appraise constraints on change in the 1980s.

Why Was Young Optimistic About Women's Advancement?

It was not at all outlandish for Ella Flagg Young to claim early in the twentieth century that women would become the key leaders in public education. One reason was that women had seen real progress in recent years. Another was that they saw themselves as part of a social and political movement that sought greater equality for women, not only for themselves but also for the betterment of society. And finally, women in the early twentieth century seemed to be capturing an increasing percentage of supervisory positions; the number of women administrators was rapidly rising.

Young saw her election to the Chicago superintendency as evidence of epochal changes that had taken place during her own lifetime. "Why, when I began teaching here in Chicago, back in 1862, it would have been absolutely impossible for a woman to have been given even a principalship," she said, "I received then $25 a month. This week I began at $10,000 a year." She claimed that when she earned a position as principal, "I was one of the first five or six women principals in the country."[10] As the 1905 NEA survey showed, over three-fifths of elementary principals in cities over 8,000 were female, and large numbers of women were being appointed as supervisors in fields like music, drawing, vocational subjects, and physical training. They were also

winning a few district superintendencies and positions as assistant superintendents and directors.

Decision makers seemed slowly to be shifting from assuming that leaders should be men to admitting that women should be considered as potential administrators. This was a change from the nineteenth century concept of women as ideal subordinates. When women first replaced males as teachers in urban public schools, they were valued not only because they were cheaper and supposedly more nurturing and skillful instructors of young children but also because they were presumed to be more compliant with the direction of male superintendents than were the old schoolmasters. Growing numbers of women in the teaching force and bureaucratization went hand in hand, with male superintendents in firm control of the system. Men praised female teachers because they were willing to work according to the dictates of their superiors and would require little direct supervision because they bowed to male authority. Their dependent situation in parental families and schools made them more content with their lot in the classroom, Horace Mann wrote, "less intent on scheming for future honors or emoluments" than men. In turn, the presence of a man as boss calmed public fears that women could not handle discipline problems or manage the business side of the system. A male leader of approved character gave the enterprise of public schooling a secure standing in the community, for running things was man's sphere.[11]

And so it went, for some time, but capable and ambitious women like Young began to seek "future honors or emoluments," and the old assumption that men were destined to command began to erode. In 1919 Louise Connolly described one episode in this process of change in her perceptive article "Is There Room At the Top for Women Educators?"[12]

> Twenty years ago there walked into the office of a school superintendent, who was a big-headed, great-hearted man, an irate lady.
>
> "I took the train as soon as I heard it," said she. "You may refuse to answer if you want to. Why did you nominate a stupid, uncouth fellow like Smith to the new office of assistant superintendent?"
>
> "Yes," said the superintendent, "I know. But he is an honest man, and will not play politics."
>
> "I can count at least fifteen honest women in your corps," said the irate lady, "who are also cultured and clever."
>
> He of the big head and great heart rumpled his hair and acknowledged, "As the Lord lives, I never thought of a woman."
>
> That could not happen today. In such cases the superintendent and all the male candidates think busily of women--and of how to fend them off. . . .

Competition for the good jobs was not easy for women, but at least they were entering the race. One reason for this was that many women leaders in education--principals, activists in teacher organizations, progressive educators, suffragists--saw themselves as part of a women's movement that was gaining political momentum and enlisting important allies among militant feminists and moderate but influential members of women's clubs and similar organizations. As Margaret Gribskov has observed, this kind of feminism in educational administration went well beyond individual ambition or seeking single goals such as the vote. In Chicago, Young was only one of a band of sophisticated and articulate women who sought to analyze social problems, to devise solutions and take action, and to work themselves into positions of power. One thinks, for example, of the path-breaking reformist social science studies of women and children by professors such as Edith and Grace Abbott and Sophinisba Breckinridge, Florence Kelley's attacks on child labor, or Jane Addam's combination of intellectual and practical leadership in a variety of social reforms.[13]

Some of these activists saw the entry of women into school administration

as yet another enlargement of women's sphere, comparable to Catharine Beecher's earlier assertion that teaching belonged to women because of their feminine qualities. Reformers like Young had reason to believe that in certain sectors of public administration that were regarded as "woman's natural field"--not only in education but in other agencies dealing with women and children--women might assume leadership. A common argument made by suffragists was that if given the vote and certain offices, women could perform civic housecleaning. Many associations of both white and black women--college alumnae groups, temperance societies, women's clubs--actively promoted such reforms and supported female candadiates such as Young for high office. Female educational administrators, in turn, ranked high among career women in their support for suffrage (fifth in a list of 20 occupations in a sample analyzed by Richard Jensen).[14]

An important element in the reform movement of activist women was the new militant leadership appearing among teachers. In New York and Chicago, large all-female teacher organizations pressed for equal pay for equal work and better salaries and working conditions. In New York the 14,000-member Interborough Association of Women Teachers successfully challenged higher pay for men teachers and promoted the career aspirations of its militant president, Grace Strachan. In Chicago Margaret Haley and Catherine Goggin were astute strategists for the Chicago Teachers Federation--composed of women elementary teachers--and supported Young in her quest for the superintendency and for the NEA presidency. It seemed to many observers that in time most urban teachers would belong to such organizations and that they would be a powerful lobby for the appointment of women as school administrators. Organizationally, women educators seemed to be gaining power in education rapidly during the first two decades of the

twentieth century.[15]

As we shall see, however, the previously almost all-male hierarchy of the NEA reacted to the challenge of women's unions by subverting them, giving them symbolic gains like a woman president every other year, and promoting an ideology of professionalism that blurred actual lines of cleavage between men and women, administrators and teachers. In statistical reports the NEA and most other agencies stopped breaking down tables by sex at the end of the second decade of the twentieth century. Amid the proliferation of other kinds of statistical reporting in an age enamored of numbers--reports so detailed that one could give the precise salary of staff in every community across the country and exact information on all sorts of other variables--data by sex became strangely inaccessible. A conspiracy of silence could hardly have been unintentional. As a result of this failure to record by gender, those who took an interest in what was happening to women in school administration and to comparative male and female salaries had to compile figures laboriously from scattered sources (this accounts, incidentally, for the scattered chronology of the statistics we cite in our own study).[16]

In the early twentieth century, however, women did seem to be winning an increased share of leadership positions in public education, especially in states where women had the vote in school elections and where they could compete for state and county superintendencies. Edith Lathrop, specialist in rural education in the United States Office of Education, wrote an article in 1922 urging college-educated women to enter careers in public education. She observed that nine states--all West of the Mississippi--had elected women as state superintendents by that year, the largest number since North Dakota began the trend in 1893. She also pointed out that the number of female county superintendents had increased from 276 in 1900 to 857 in 1922, mostly

concentrated in the West and in places where county superintendents were elected rather than appointed. "The college girl who is ambitious for educational leadership, won by way of political competition," she added, "may well take Horace Greeley's advice to young men anxious for opportunity and a career: 'Go West, young man, go West!'" She mentioned as well that women held many administrative positions in city school systems. The barriers seemed to be coming down.[17]

Positions Women Actually Have Held--And Lost

The number of positions held by women and the amount of political activism and social reform did seem to be climbing upward to justify the hopes of Young and her peers. But a closer analysis of the jobs actually occupied by women, the long term trends, and the blunting of feminist militance in educational associations reveal a more depressing prospect.

We focus in this section on the marginal power, pay, and prestige of the administrative positions most women held. To say that the fate of women in educational administration in the twentieth century is depressing is not to deny that there were many impressive individual leaders of the kind Margaret Gribskov is investigating in the western states. There clearly were state and county women superintendents who gave inspiring leadership, and many women were leaders in educational reform. But by and large, women had to fight hard even for modest positions, and they fell further and further behind as time went on. As Connolly put it in 1919, "woman has arrived in numbers only in the lower strata of the upper crust. She has been invited considerably to care for the blind and deaf, and very largely to train the deficient and feeble-minded."[18] Important though these jobs may have been, they kept women tending the powerless, an extension of child care roles. Women continued to face narrowly restricted

opportunities.

Statistics on employment of female administrators in local districts amply document Connolly's statement that they were in the lower strata. In 1922 there were only 31 female city superintendents in the United States (the key position in the local power structure of schooling). A decade later the number had increased, but there were still 25 states with no woman serving as a superintendent. The few women chief administrators were concentrated in the poorest paid and least prestigious positions in small communities in rural states like Vermont, New Mexico, Alabama, and Idaho. This pattern of distribution has continued to the 1970s.[19]

Women working as central office administrators in city school systems were mostly clustered in sex-segregated positions in which they interacted primarily with female elementary teachers (and sometimes also taught children). In Pittsburg, for example, the 62 women supervisors were distributed in art, household economy, hygiene, child welfare, kindergartens, music, and commercial studies. Typically, both in the past and present, they have occupied staff positions rather than holding line responsibilities in the central administration, and their work has usually not been of the kind that offered visibility and power leading to advancement up the hierarchy.[20]

Connolly pointed out that in bureaucratized twentieth century school systems "there is an inclined plane which is also a graduated screen, and the men govern the grade and the scale." Because they may feel that "'the women voters (or the women's clubs) will make a fuss' or that 'the suffragists will get after us,' or that 'women ought to be represented,' a place--usually in the supervisorship of primary work, or domestic work, or welfare work--is set apart for some women, and the woman is selected by a board of men." Their judgment in such

matters was less than ideal: "A male board of examiners has been known to select for a position of grave responsibility a girl two years out of college, with a B.A. and a high color, turning down a sallow lady of 35, with three degrees, ten years of fruitful experience, and a notable capacity for gentle leadership. Doubtless a board of women would make equally egregious mistakes in rating young men." However casual might be their standards for appraising female supervisors of women, male administrators believed firmly that the masculinity of their male colleagues should be protected from female bosses. "Don't worry," a state superintendent told some local superintendents when he was pressured to hire a woman as assistant superintendent, "I'm not going to send a person in petticoats to inspect your work."[21]

Of all the administrative positions held by large numbers of women, perhaps the elementary principalship offered the greatest opportunity for autonomy and instructional leadership. The fear of men being supervised by "a person in petticoats" did not apply to most primary schools after the almost complete takeover of elementary education by female teachers. As we have seen, in 1905 women held a strong edge over men as elementary principals in cities. Subsequent surveys showed that the percentage of women dropped from 55 in 1928 to 41 in 1948 to 38 in 1958 to 22 in 1968.[22]

As school administrators women often fared better when they were elected by their fellow citizens--male and female--than when they were appointed by a male board or superior. In western states a number of capable women worked their way via the ballot box up the ladder from classroom teacher to country superintendency to state superintendency. A close look at the actual work they did and the rewards they received suggests, however, that the county and state superintendencies were not prizes to be compared with the best jobs in cities.[23]

Table 3 reveals much about the characteristics, salaries, and nature of the work of county superintendents in 1928. It focuses on the states where women constituted at least a majority of county superintendents that year, while providing national median figures for comparison. These officials were mostly middle-aged people who had devoted their lives to education. The majority of nineteenth century county superintendents in most parts of the nation had been laymen in other occupations--minister, doctor, farmer--who assumed the job part-time as a form of public service or for the small fees attached. By 1928, however, the county superintendency had become a full-time job for former teachers. They were not highly trained professionals; the median years beyond elementary school for the group as a whole were only 7.8, while over half did not hold a B.A. In states where women predominated the educational attainment of county superintendents was substantially less than for the nation as a whole. The median salary was somewhat below that of secondary principals and substantially below that of superintendents in cities from 2,500 to 5,000. The salaries of county superintendents in states where women were in the majority were generally well below even that low national figure. The job was rigorous, requiring officials to travel long distances over dusty or muddy rural roads to visit dozens of separate schools. In a decentralized system of local governance their authority and influence often depended more on their personal talents than on their office. While such a job might be a step up from the classroom, it was hardly a position of much power, pay, or prestige.[24]

Much the same could be said of the state superintendency, especially in the states west of the Mississippi where women gained the office. In the years from 1900 to 1969 an estimated 373 men and 45 women held that position; others are difficult to identify by sex, in part because of the common use of initials. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Washington,

TABLE 3

Statistics on County Superintendents in States Where Women Constitute a Majority, Compared with National Medians, 1928

	Age	Percent Women Married	Percent Men Married	Median Years Education Experience	Continuous Years as County Superintendent	Median Years Training Beyond Elem. School	Percent Holding No Academic Degree	Median Number Buildings Under Supt's Jurisdiction	Median Number 1-teacher Schools in Jurisdiction	Median Salary
National Median	44.8	31	91	19.9	5.4	7.8	53	55	38	$ 2,312
Arizona - 89%*	--	50	100	--	--	--	100	--	--	--
Colorado - 86%*	46	48	100	14.6	--	6.3	69	39	24	1,703
Idaho	40.5	39	100	14.0	3.5	6.3	92	27	15	1,590
Minnesota	47.6	19	75	21.5	7.9	5.8	78	89	85	1,958
Montana - 92%*	38.2	28	100	14.4	2.5	5.9	97	57	44	1,764
Nebraska	44	36	82	20.7	7.1	6.9	72	79	68	1,802
New Mexico - 79%*	42.5	45	66	9.3	2.3	6.1	83	28	15	2,271
Oregon	47.1	71	90	20.0	6.8	6.8	62	68	45	1,780
South Dakota	37.1	8	89	13.2	2.9	6.4	76	71	67	1,627
Washington	49.3	30	100	21.8	1.8	6.6	75	45	19	1,902
Wyoming - 90%*	53.3	22	100	21.0	4.0	6.2	100	75	68	1,726

*Percent females given where indicated by Butterworth

Source: Julian E. Butterworth. The County Superintendent in the United States (U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 6, 1932; Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1932).

and Wyoming all had two or more women as superintendents; in Colorado, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming women won half or more of the positions. Dolores Colberg, who was Superintendent of Public Instruction in Montana from 1969 to 1976, speculated on why her state had elected only women since 1917:[26]

> In a way it's part of the frontier make-up--after all, the West is pretty recent history. When these territories were being settled, the men were out there knocking down trees and building cabins, getting herds together and plowing the land. So if any schooling was going to take place, it essentially fell to women. Virtually all the county superintendents in Montana are women--that's an elected position. They're also poorly paid; that may account for some of it, too. . . . With the succession of women elected in Montana to state superintendent, people have identified the job as a woman's position. There have been some very strong women superintendents in Montana. . . . Mary Condon was a superb state superintendent--lots of guts and lots of integrity.

The female county and state superintendents in Montana were isolated from the key power group in the state, the all-male Administrators Association of city superintendents (during Colberg's eight-year tenure there was only one woman superintendent--in a 40-pupil district--and no female secondary school principals). Her opponent in 1968 "distributed campaign literature saying 'the MAN for the job,'" emphasizing his sex in large type and red ink. He lost, but she said that she had problems with the male administrators who blamed her for the Catch-22 that she had not had their administrative experience.[27]

Idaho had an odd administrative arrangement until 1933. There was an elected superintendent--usually female--who was paid $2,400 in 1930 while an appointed (and with one exception male) Commissioner of Education (who had the real power) was paid $7,500. In 1933 the two offices were combined and made appointive; thereafter only men were chosen. In some states, like Idaho and Montana where women's suffrage came early, the post may have come to be thought

of as a woman's job--because politicians wanted to balance the ticket with a female candidate. In such states wages for the state superintendents were lower than the national average and the staffs were smaller than the median. By contrast, in states where salaries and bureaucracies were large, men predominated. In New York, for example, which paid the superintendent $15,000 in 1930 and had a staff of almost 600, only men held the job throughout the twentieth century.[28]

In most states the state superintendent exercised little power. Educational reformers complained for over a hundred years that state executives were figureheads who collected statistics, disbursed funds, and relayed messages from the legislature and state board, with little opportunity for initiative or leadership. They usually earned less than city superintendents. But when the pay and prestige of the office increased--usually with its becoming an appointive office--in the years following 1950, the number of women dropped.[29]

Telling the achievements, both individually and collectively, of women administrators is an important task, one that will enrich the historical record. But our point here is that the hopes of women leaders at the beginning of this century were not realized, and their temporary gains were reversed. By and large, they filled the posts that men did not want, and when their jobs became attractive to men, they were displaced.

How Males Maintained Their Hegemony in Educational Administration

The question of how men managed to monopolize the best jobs in public education is part of the question of why men have predominated in most sectors of most societies throughout recorded time. We do not want to tackle that larger issue but rather to integrate elements of the three approaches we mentioned

earlier: the sex-role socialization view, an organizational analysis, and the approach that sees sexual inequities in schools as reflections of inequity in the larger society.

In the first place, the school boards that overwhelmingly appointed men to positions as city superintendent, state superintendent, and similar jobs were themselves composed largely of men. Women, of course, vastly outnumbered men in the initial pool of teachers from which aspiring administrators were drawn. When the performance of female and male administrators has been compared--as in much research on elementary principals, for example--the work of the two sexes has been judged comparable. From such work one would assume a meritocratic system to be neutral as to gender. Yet study after study has shown that male boards have believed males to be superior candidates for the top positions. Thus the attitudes of the lay decision makers have obviously been a major reason for the scarcity of women at the top.[30]

Was this a herd instinct of men to favor their own, a bias without a sound rationale in organizational or societal realities? Probably not. Men did enjoy--and do enjoy--important status advantages both within the system and in linking it with the surrounding community.

Within the district males had access to the men at the top of the district hierarchy and could get to know them on grounds of intimacy normally inaccessible to women. In 1936 Helen Davis described the problem women faced: "However fair and democratic the management tries to be, it is and probably always will be true that thinking is matured, plans are weighed in the balance, implications and alternatives worked out--in other words, decisions really made--on the golf course and around the luncheon table rather than at staff meetings. Moreover, it is by this same process that individual growth is stimulated and that administrators get to know and to estimate properly the capacities of their staff

members."[31] It was, and is, much more common for male superiors in school systems to serve as sponsors for other men; what Davis calls "rigid social customs" made friendships between men and women highly suspect. Men also had unusual opportunities to get the attention of superiors and to curry public favor through activities like coaching successful teams, a notable and visible exercise of leadership.

Men have had similar advantages in the community, ways of tying the schools to the power structure of the larger social environment. They could join all-male organizations like the Rotary Clubs and Chambers of Commerce and there gain important information, friendships, and political support. One western superintendent told of his hunting and fishing with men in the Chamber of Commerce, thereby winning firm friends who supported him in his reform plans "not because they were advocates of the educational principle upon which the experiment was based, but because they wanted their friend to win."[32] In a society that was deeply biased in its distribution of power, in which informal networks and voluntary organizations of the influential were often single-sex, being male was a strong asset. When the goals of schooling were diffuse and vague, when assessment of performance was accordingly tricky, picking a leader with appropriate social characteristics--male, white, middle-aged, experienced, a member of the right clubs, of the right religion, and usually physically prepossessing--seemed eminently reasonable, for such characteristics matched valued attributes in the larger community.[33]

In the cultural beliefs of that larger society, marriage operated with an opposite valence for men and women. For men, marriage was normally an asset if not a tacit requirement in upward mobility, whereas for women it was often a liability if not an actual barrier. Surveys of male school superintendents,

for example, have shown consistently for a half century that they were almost all married. There were numerous articles and books of advice telling "Mrs. Administrator" how to help her husband fulfill his ambitions.[34]

By contrast, until recently women in education have mostly been young and single. This was as it should be, thought ninteenth-century reformers like Mann and Beecher. While they recognized that some female teachers might not marry--in which case their occupation would provide them with a respectable if parsimonious existence--they believed that the great mass of women teachers would and should teach for only a few years and then leave the profession to become wives and mothers. As late as 1900, when 70 percent of all public school teachers were women, 90 percent of these female teachers were unmarried (and many of the other tenth were widows), young (median age 25), and inexperienced (an average tenure of about five years). Strong cultural beliefs dictated that married women belonged at home, caring for husbands and children. When married women did work, it was usually because survival of the family depended on their paychecks, as in the case of wives of disabled men or working class blacks and immigrants. Those who did work in the schools, then as now, typically carried the burden of two jobs, their professional duties and running a home, each very demanding.[35]

Not only cultural norms but also official policies barred married women from teaching and administration. In 1928 the National Education Association found that about three-fifths of urban districts prohibited the hiring of married teachers; only half of those systems permitted teachers who married to continue in their jobs. The situation grew worse during the depression, as thousands of new districts passed policies aimed at saving jobs for male breadwinners or single women. In 1936 Helen Davis wrote that education, like other professions, "will be occupied on the whole by two kinds of women, those who

refuse marriage except on their own terms and those who have not been able to find husbands, while the general run of able and so-called 'normal' women will be excluded because they prefer marriage." In 1940 only 22 percent of women teachers were married.[36]

Presented with a dilemma that men did not face--the choice between a public career and the intimacy of marriage--female teachers also encountered severe restrictions on their conduct while employed. These are some samples of the provisions written into contracts, rules more germane to children or servants than to professionals:[37]

> Not to fall in love, become engaged, or secretly married. To abstain from dancing, immodest dressing, playing cards, smoking. To sleep at least eight hours each night; to eat carefully, and to take every precaution to keep in the best of health. To take a vital part in Sunday School work.

Women who did not marry but who continued in educational service faced the persistent stereotype of the pinched-faced old maid. One way of avoiding this stereotype and pursuing a career was to follow Hamlet's advice to Ophelia: "Get thee to a nunnery." Of the nine percent of high school principals who were women in 1949, two-thirds were sisters in religious orders. Although all of the presidents of 35 Protestant women's colleges in 1934 were men, 46 of the 54 presidents of Catholic women's colleges were female members of religious orders. Another common pattern among successful female administrators was the married woman who carried the title of "Mrs." but who was single: Ella Flagg Young, for example, was a widow whose older husband died when she was still a young woman; Susan Dorsey, superintendent of the Los Angeles Schools, was deserted by her minister husband before she began her career. Even in recent years, as various studies have shown, female administrators are far less likely

to be married than typical American men. In 1965, 92 percent of the male elementary principals in one sample were married, as compared with only 27 percent of the female principals. Even when married women pursued a career in teaching, they were likely to drop out for a time to take care of their children, thereby lacking the continuity men believed to be so important.[38]

Looking at the contrasting aspirations of men and women helps to illuminate how marriage detoured women from careers in education while it helped men onward and upward. Early sex-role socialization of boys and girls, continuously reinforced by the culture throughout the life cycle, produced quite different goals and satisfactions for males and females. Since teachers constituted a rough cross-section of average Americans, it is hardly suprising that the dual culture, male and female, of the larger society influenced them deeply.

To begin with aspirations, in 1958 Ward Mason found that only 29 percent of male beginning teachers and 16 percent of females planned to stay in classrooms all their working lives. They projected quite different alternative futures, however. Horace Mann would have been pleased by the women: 78 percent of the single teachers said that they would leave when married. In general, the women showed aspirations that matched well the age distribution of female teachers in 1960; they intended to stay in teaching until they had children but then to return after their children grew up (during and after World War II the ban on married teachers disappeared). Only nine percent were interested in administrative careers. The men, by contrast, planned to work continuously, but 51 percent of them wanted to move out of the classroom into administration (20 percent planned to leave education altogether).[39]

The aspirations of teachers correlated with the satisfactions they found

in their work. Recall that Horace Mann had recommended women as teachers because they would be content with their lot and take pleasure in working with children. Dan Lortie's study of teachers in the 1960s discovered that women took primary satisfactions from the emotional and intellectual development of their pupils, working alone in their "cellular" classrooms. Mann's contrary picture of males as ambitious, competitive, eager for "future honors and emoluments" is an apt portrait of the mobile male teacher on his way up the administrative ladder, adept at "getting the attention of superiors" and ready for the pushing and hauling of school district politics. Often sensitive to the potential image of the teacher--especially the teacher of small children--as a sissy, men were more apt to teach in high school, to engage in publicly visible activities like sports that could attract esteem, and to interact socially with male power wielders in the community. Such a teacher might be marked as a principal-to-be. These are stereotypes, of course; there were highly interactive women and quiet men in schools; but stereotypes generally have a basis in reality.[40]

In graduate work in educational administration the professors were almost all male and they recruited and admitted chiefly men. The sponsoring and placement network was not called an "old boy" system by accident. A graduate of Teachers College, Columbia, recalled that his mentors there all "had the knack of conveying the feeling that they were definitely aware of you as a person, had an affinity for you, and were concerned with being helpful to you in your future career. . . . They took pride in talking about 'their boys.'"[41]

Connolly commented that the new university experts who were seeking to professionalize educational administration professed liberal attitudes towards women but shunted them to "positions demanding drudgery." The result was

that "with no more formulated or explicit organization than the capitalists have employed toward the proletariat, (they) have closed ranks and have, like the amiable Quaker in Uncle Tom's Cabin, intimated, 'Friend, thee isn't wanted here,' and, as the old adage has it, 'set her down without it.'" Not that this impulse to protect privilege was openly acknowledged: "You may search the educational literature of the past two decades for this tendency and you will search in vain! The journals which they edit, the conventions which they run, and associations which they form, say nothing about it. . . . They just say nothing, and keep Alice out--if they can. There are Eila Flagg Young episodes ever and anon, but they are Monadnocks, not mountain chains in the educational landscape."[42]

In professional associations like the NEA--in which reputations were made and norms established--men continued to dominate the decision-making structure even after concessions were made to co-opt the women through devices like the representative assembly adopted in 1920. At the first convention under the new charter in 1921, out of 553 delegates there were only 81 elementary teachers, compared with 33 state superintendents, 104 city superintendents, and 88 principals; in all, an estimated 297 delegates were administrators, and those were overwhelmingly male. Leadership on the NEA boards and committees and in the state associations was also predominantly male. The key NEA power-wielders, the executive secretaries, continued to be men. The presidents of the rival American Federation of Teachers were also almost all male, despite the early leadership of women in the union movement. All but eight of the 40 presidents of the major black teachers' association were men.[43]

Despite a few educators--mostly women--who sought to highlight sexual inequities, most leaders in the NEA supported the ideology of a united profession that knew no boundaries between teachers and administrators, men and women.

All "professionals" shared similar purposes and interests. The belief system that undergirded this official ideology of professionalism was meritocratic and universalistic; if males were running things, it was because they were more committed and competent professionals. No one saw more clearly than Connolly the ironies in the male-formulated version of hierarchical idealism: [44]

> To see one of these crusaders haranguing a hall full of elementary school teachers about "the ideals of our profession," willingly carrying the load of their docility up the Hill of Difficulty, and to see this host of privates, conscientiously striving to amalgamate the impulses to independent action, scientific observation, and freedom . . . with the meticulous obedience and close formation which tomorrow's routine is going to require of them, is a humorously pathetic spectacle. But the lads are in earnest.

The rituals of the associations and the ideals of professionalism served an important purpose in obscuring the facts of male domination. They were all the more effective because not only were the lads in earnest but the women (who made up four-fifths of the "profession") generally accepted the rhetoric of professionalism as well. It has not been until the last generation that male hegemony has been seriously questioned in educational associations, in the profession as a whole, and in the larger society.

Constraints on Change in the 1980s

A predicted golden age never arrived for women school administrators. What are the prospects for the future? Probably not sanguine but not hopeless either.

Retrenchment seems unavoidable in the 1980s in public education. Declining enrollments, tax revolts, a drain of students into private schools, a low level of public confidence--such trends in recent years suggest to some people that

public education has become a "declining industry." It is unlikely that educators will be able to continue to reform schools as they have in the past, by adding programs and staff to meet new problems as expanding numbers of students and swelling budgets generated a sense of optimism. By contrast, the problem has become where to cut, not where to add. As a result, there will be few new administrative positions and there probably will be cut-backs in existing ones. These conditions could intensify sexual competition and resentment. The demand for sexual equity cannot be met by the older, less controversial, method of reform by accretion. Women are trying now to enter public school leadership not on a floodtide of expansion but during an ebb tide of retrenchment.[45]

The experience of management in other "declining industries" is not auspicious. People in the best jobs--now white males--tend to hold on to their positions, thereby producing an aging corps of top officials. Ambitious and talented younger staff often see opportunity constricting and leave the organization for brighter prospects elsewhere. Ominous signs--such as the abysmal test scores of teachers in training--suggest that this may be happening in public education. Turnover in administrative jobs may be greatest in school districts that have the toughest instructional and budgetary problems; it is in such schools that minority administrators have appeared in greatest numbers in superintendencies and principalships. White and minority women may find themselves competing with minority males for administrative jobs in such districts. Ruth Love's recent appointment to the Chicago superintendency--the first woman superintendent there since Young--may be a harbinger of a broader trend. One woman administrator suggested it was best to go "where things are in so much trouble that nobody will notice that you're a woman."[46] Given the

enormous problems intrinsic to such systems, the competition may turn out to be over who will stand at the helm of the Titanic.

We have argued that the militance of feminists early in this century energized the campaign to increase the number of female educational administrators and that it produced some gains in certain domains, such as county and state superintendencies. The women's movement of the last generation has illuminated institutional sexism in public schools and spurred the ambitions of many women. The conspiracy of silence in professional associations over unequal opportunity for females has ended as groups like the NEA have mounted attacks on the various forms of sexism in education. Early surveys of the actual gains made by women in administration have been discouraging, however. In the relatively liberal state of Wisconsin, for example, from 1970 to 1975 when the women's movement was gathering momentum, the number of female administrators dropped in almost every category. No female superintendents or assistant superintendents were appointed, and where vacancies occurred in other positions, men were more often chosen to fill them, even where the previous incumbent had been a woman. More women than men were fired when positions were eliminated during retrenchment.[47]

The resiliency of earlier sex-stereotyping of jobs and differential patterns of aspiration among women also appeared in a survey of women in central office positions conducted in 1973. Women continued to be supervised by males at the top and to supervise chiefly other females. Modest aspirations continued to be the norm: 68 percent of the women planned to stay in the same slot, while only nine percent looked for promotion within the same district. The importance of male sponsorship had not died either: 56 percent of the women obtained their jobs because of the initiative of some one else, usually a male superior.[48]

To point out that deeply entrenched patterns of male dominance have not yielded quickly to a newly aroused demand for sexual equity, backed by new laws and pressures for change within educational associations, is not to submit to despair or to counsel inaction. It is, however, to suggest the difficulty of attacking unequal opportunity, especially under conditions of stagflation and retrenchment. People concerned about sexual equity in educational administration are in for a long haul. What can be done?

The burgeoning literature on female school administrators does not lack admonitions or exhortations. Most of it focuses on two kindred attitudinal barriers to the advancement of women: on discrimination by male school boards and top administrators; and on the psychological barriers that limit the aspirations and inhibit the behavior of the women themselves. Employers are admonished to obey the laws of sex discrimination, to recruit women actively, and to dispel myths of female incompetence. Professional leaders are encouraged to attract more women into training programs and to serve as sponsors and mentors. Women are exhorted to become more ambitious and assertive, to seek out role models, to obtain internships and advanced credentials, and to form "old girl" networks to assist one another.[49]

This approach is useful for increasing awareness of injustice and giving a strong sense of belonging to a campaign to do something about it. Often such exhortations, however, are short on analysis and lacking a sense of history; they may inadvertently create the illusion that once people discover inequities and have a new consciousness, change may come about quickly. The historical record discourages such easy hopes. As we have suggested, women have long been aware of a systematic denial of opportunity, and efforts to do something about it have waxed and waned. To bring about real and lasting change

will require persistent effort at all three levels we have discussed: the individual, the organization, and the broader society. These levels are closely interconnected, and nowhere more so than in the use of gender as an organizing principle in society.

We have suggested that sex-role socialization of individuals does help to explain the different aspirations and behavior of males and females and to illuminate the different role that marriage plays in the careers of men and women. One way to overcome barriers to female advancement has been the compensatory resocialization represented, for example, by assertiveness training workshops for women (and, less often, by gender awareness programs for men). The popularity of such psychological approaches in American culture is not surprising: it fits the traditional ideology of self-help (Horatio Alger in skirts); it reflects the traditional dominance of psychology in the field of education; and it seems plausible in an individualistic, success-conscious society. But such an approach comes close to blaming the victim for her plight. In the short run, compensatory resocialization may help a few women to read the informal language of male-dominated organizations, to dress so well "they can ride into the executive suite on a clotheshorse," or to surpass men in their networking skills. Such programs are often predicated on a questionable assumption: that women can succeed by becoming more like men--more competitive, more ambitious, better team players. That may be true in the short turn for women who succeed, but the costs both to upwardly mobile women and to the organizations they serve could be great--not to mention the costs to women in general and to society. In our view, current cultural prescriptions about what is appropriate "male" and "female" behaviors are already too restrictive--we would favor a gradual evolution toward greater androgyny--and to the degree

that women are different in their talents from men, organizations should have the benefit of those different skills and perceptions. An effort to make organizations "sex-neutral" is an exercise in self-delusion. As long as society invidiously reflects differences of gender, so long will its institutions continue to be inequitable.[50]

One part of gender relationships that clearly requires rethinking by both males and females is the connection between career and marriage. In part, the women's movement of the last generation can be understood as a painful realignment of cultural beliefs with actual changes that have taken place in the economy and society. The fact is that today women constitute almost half of the paid workforce, and of those a majority are married. (Less than a third of women teachers are single, for example.) No longer is it assumed that the proper place for a married woman is only in the home; nor, as a glimpse at the pages of Ms. Magazine will illustrate, is a career woman assumed to be sexless. But role conflicts between home and work still constitute a general cultural barrier to career advancement of working women. If in a time of inflation women no longer have to choose between a job and a family, they still face primary responsibility for running the home, and they work many more hours there than do their husbands. No industrialized society has solved this problem, though some, like Sweden, have made steps in the right direction. Until it is gradually resolved--and that will require the resocialization of men even more than of women--women will lack the equivalent resources of time and energy to devote to careers in the paid labor force, including educational administration. It is one of the most basic forms of inequity to require women, but not men, to choose between a fulfilling career and marriage.[51]

Cultural changes of this sort take far more time than the passage of laws

like Title IX. As earlier experiences such as the aftermath of the winning of female suffrage or the backsliding to the feminine mystique after World War II demonstrate, return to earlier cultural norms of male dominance is common. But the new facts of employment of women coupled with an awareness of common group interests of women in recent years may make possible a realignment of cultural values with new conditions. We are not overly optimistic about this--surely it is not inevitable given the conservative trends of the 1980s--but we think that persistent group efforts and changing individual values may slowly bring about change in the broader culture. If women are to achieve equity, however, it will not be so much through one-by-one ascent by individual resocialization to male norms. It will be through collective action and by the changing cultural values of men as well as those of women.[52]

John Stuart Mill noted over a century ago that a unique disability of women as a disadvantaged group stems from their traditional isolation from each other in the home. Today, with a majority of women working in the paid labor force and inflation-driven forces keeping them there, a common experience of discrimination may make women more aware collectively of their common interest in securing equality. Part of this collective sense of wrong--as opposed to an individual campaign of self-help--fuels consciousness-raising groups at the grass-roots level. These serve, as Jo Freeman notes, a function similar to factories for workers and the churches for blacks in the southern civil rights movement: they overcome isolation and can serve as a powerful agency for social change.[53]

One form of such collective action will be to keep up the legal and political pressure on organizations where power lies in American society. It does not make sense to expect quick results or to think that a single set of

strategies will work, given the great variety of organizations. A large corporation under court order to remedy sex discrimination, for example, presents a far more controllable domain than public education, which has over 15,000 separate and decentralized districts, each with their own lay boards and distinct relationships with their surrounding environments. Rosabeth Kanter's suggestions for remedying sex inequities in business corporations--putting women in positions that offer visibility and opportunities for advancement; offering them real power rather than dead-end, sex-typed specialties; and employing women in sufficient numbers to avoid their being tokens--may be useful guidelines for big city systems. Her central point that institutional roles powerfully shape behavior offers a useful corrective to the sex-role socialization theme. But organizations vary greatly in their structure and functioning and in their responsiveness to political and legal pressures for sex equity.[53]

We originally observed that one can analyze unequal opportunity on three levels: the individual, the organization, and the broader society. Although the history of equity for women and the staggering uncertainties of the 1980s make us doubly reticent about predictions, we believe that the movement for social justice for women will fare best if it proceeds at all three levels simultaneously. The militance of Ella Flagg Young's generation arose from a sense of outrage, of opportunities denied, of lives cramped and maimed. The golden age she anticipated did not come about, although the social movement of which she was a part was reborn and reshaped. With the present generation, made more aware by experience of the complexity of such change, rests the task of realizing that dream deferred.

FOOTNOTES

1. Young, as quoted in anonymous article "The Highest Salaried Woman in the World," Western Journal of Education, 14 (1909), 515; John T. McManis, Ella Flagg Young and a Half-Century of the Chicago Public Schools (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1916).

2. David Tyack, "Pilgrim's Progress: Toward a Social History of the School Superintendency, 1860-1960," History of Education Quarterly, 17 (1977), 295-300; W. Vance Grant and C. George Lind, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1974 Edition (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1975), 53; Jackqueline Clement, Sex Bias in School Leadership (Evanston, Ill.: Integrated Education Association, 1975).

3. Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker, "Women in Educational Governance: A Statistical Portrait," Educational Researcher, 3 (1974), 5-6; Suzanne L. Taylor, "Educational Leadership: A Male Domain?" Phi Delta Kappan, 54 (1973), 125; June Marr, "Women in Policy-Making Positions in State Departments of Education, 1950-1972," Seminar Paper, Stanford University, 1973; Glenda Lee Landon, "Perceptions of Sex Role Stereotyping and Women Teachers' Administrative Career Aspirations," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975, 40-44.

4. Suzanne Estler with Cynthia Davis, "Women in Decision-Making," unpublished manuscript, Center for Research on Women, Stanford University, Table 1.

5. Valerie Kincade Oppenheimer, The Female Labor Force in the United States: Demographic and Economic Factors Governing its Growth and Changing Composition (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1976); Myra H. Strober, "Toward Dimorphics: A Summary Statement to the Conference on Occupational Segregation," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1 (1976), 293-302; Myra H. Strober and David Tyack, "Why Do Women Teach and Men Manage? A Report on Research on Schools," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 5 (1980), 494-503;

Margery Davis, "Woman's Place Is at the Typewriter," Radical America, 8 (1974), 1-28; Sheila M. Rothman, Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present (New York: Basic Books, 1978), 42-60; Dee Garrison, "The Tender Technicians: The Feminization of Librarianship, 1876-1905," Journal of Social History, 6 (1972-73), 131-53; Jody Newmyer, "The Image Problem of the Librarian: Feminity and Social Control," Journal of Library History, 6 (1976), 44-67.

6. Joan Kelly-Gadol, "The Social Relations of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1 (1976), 812-15; we are indebted to colleagues at the Center for Research on Women, Stanford University, especially Myra Strober, for conversations and criticisms that helped to formulate this notion of the structuring of opportunity by gender.

7. Landon, "Perceptions of Sex Role Stereotyping," gives a useful review of the sex role literature in Ch. 2.; see also, Jean Stockard et al., Sex Equity in Education (New York: Academic Press, 1980), Chs. 1, 3, 6; Sandra Bem, "On the Utility of Alternative Procedures for Assessing Psychological Androgeny," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, April 1977, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 196-205. and Sandra L. Bem, Wendy Martyna and Carol Watson, "Sex Typing and Androgeny: Further Exploration of the Expressive Domain,' Journal of Personality and Social Psychology November 1976, Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 1016.

8. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Men and Women of the Corporation (New York:Basic Books, 1977); Suzanne Estler, "Women as Leaders in Public Education," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1 (1975), 363-86; we are indebted to Anne Miner, formerly Affirmative Action Officer at Stanford University, for the "tooth fairy" analogy.

9. Heidi Hartmann, "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex," in

Martha Blaxall and Barbara Reagan, eds., Women and the Workplace: The Implications of Occupational Segregation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976); Berenice A. Carroll, ed., Liberating Women's History: Theoretical and Critical Essays (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1976); Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1977) argues for looking at the connections between work and family, domains too often separated in scholarly inquiry; see also, Elizabeth Pleck, "Two Worlds in One: Work and Family," Journal of Social History, 10 (1976), 178-95.

10. "Highest Salaried Woman," 516; Joan Smith, Ella Flagg Young: Portrait of a Leader (Ames, Iowa: Educational Studies Press, 1979).

11. David Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 59-65; Joan N. Burstyn, "Historical Perspectives on Women in Educational Leadership," in Sari Knopp Biklen and Marilyn B. Branigan, eds., Women and Educational Leadership (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1980), 65-75.

12. Louise Connolly, "Is There Room at the Top for Women Educators?" The Woman Citizen, March 8, 1919, 840.

13. Margaret Gribskov, "Feminism and the Woman School Administrator," in Biklen and Branigan, Educational Leadership, 77-91; Geraldine Clifford is currently exploring the relationship between teaching and various modes of feminist activism: "The Female Teacher and the Feminist Movement," unpublished paper, University of California, Berkeley; and "Marry, Stitch, Die, or Do Worse," in Harvey Kantor and David Tyack, eds., Work, Youth and Schooling: Vocationalism in American Education (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, forthcoming);

Patricia Schmuck, "Context of Change: The Women's Movement as a Political Process," in Stockard, Sex Equity, 165-83.

14. Richard Jensen, "Family, Career, and Reform: Women Leaders of the Progressive Era," in Michael Gorden, ed., The Family in Social-Historical Perspective (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973), 273; Burstyn, "Women and Educational Leadership"; Kathryn K. Sklar, Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973); Carl N. Degler, At Odds: Women and the Family from the Revolution to the Present (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), ch. 13.

15. Grace Strachan, Equal Pay for Equal Work: The Story of the Struggle for Justice Being Made by the Women Teachers of New York (New York: B.F. Buck, 1910); Ralph Schmid, "A Study of the Organizational Structure of the National Education Association, 1884-1921," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington University, 1963; Margaret Haley, "Why Teachers Should Organize," NEA, Addresses and Proceedings, 1904, 145-52.

16. Clement, Sex Bias, comments on the persistence of this conspiracy of silence well into the computer age.

17. Edith A. Lathrop, Teaching as a Vocation for College Women (National Council of Administrative Women in Education, Monograph 3, 1922, reprinted from The Arrow, March, 1922), 3-4.

18. Connolly, "Room at the Top?" 841.

19. Lathrop, Teaching, 3; Dennis H. Cooke, "Trend Is Toward Smaller Turnover Among City Superintendents," Nation's Schools, 11 (1933), 25.

20. Lathrop, Teaching, 3; NEA, Report on Salaries, 1905, 54-69; Patricia Schmuck, Sex Differentiation in Public School Administration (Washington, D.C.: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1976).

21. Connolly, "Room at the Top?" 841-42, 843, 840.

22. Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, The Elementary School Principalship in 1968 (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1968), 11.

23. Lathrop, Teaching, 3-4; Gribskov, "Feminism."

24. Julian E. Butterworth, The County Superintendent in the United States (U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 6, 1932· Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1932).

26. All state superintendents of schools to 1969 are listed in Jim B. Pearson and Edgar Fuller, eds. Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, Vol. 1; Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1969;

Michael Imber of the University of Kansas compiled data by sex. Colberg's comments are given in an interview with John Pittenger in a forthcoming book edited by Jerome Murphy, State Leadership in Education: On Being a Chief State School Officer.

27. Colberg, ibid.

28. Research Division, National Education Association, Studies in State School Administration: Staffs and Salaries in State Departments of Education (Study No. 9; Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1931), 45, 4.

29. Ward Reeder, "Re-Organizing the Office of the Chief State School Official," American School Board Journal, 71 (1925),pp. 43, 150; Ellwood P. Cubberley, State Schoo Administration (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927); Marr, "Women in State Departments."

30. Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker, "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavior and Attitudinal Studies," in Fishel and Pottker, eds., Sex Bias in the Schools: The Research Evidence (Rutherford, N.J.: Farleigh Dickinson

University, 1977), 289-99. Kimball Wiles and Hulda Grobman, "Principals as Leaders," Nation's Schools, 56 (1955), 75; Hulda Grobman and Vynce A. Hines, "What Makes a Good Principal?" National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 40 (1956), 5-16; Neal Gross and Ann Trask, Men and Women as Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: Cooperative Research, USOE, 1964); "How Do Women Rate?" Nation's Schools, 37 (1946), 45; Mrs. Vern Vanderburgh, "Women as Administrators," Nation's Schools, 37 (1946), 48; George Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927).

32. Charles S. Meek, "How Shall the Superintendent Spend His Time?" NEA Addresses and Proceedings, 1921, 730-31.

33. Lotus D. Coffman, "The American School Superintendent," Educational Administration and Supervision, 1 (1915), 17; W.W. Charters, Jr., "Social Class Analysis and the Control of Public Education," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (1953), 268-83; on the importance of ambiguity in organizational goals, see Michael D. Cohen and James March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974).

34. Tyack, "Pilgrims' Progress," and surveys by American Association of School Superintendents cited there; G.H. Marshall, Clara W. Marshall, and W.W. Carpenter, The Administrator's Wife (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1941)--bibliography of similar articles cited, 120-21.

35. John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, Education of the American Population (1960 Census Monograph; Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1967), ch. 3; Degler, At Odds, chs. 15-16.

36. Davis, Women's Professional Problems, 17; Hazel Davis and Agnes Samuelson, "Women in Education," Journal of Social Issues, 6 (1950), 29; David W. Peters,

The Status of the Married Woman Teacher (New York: Teachers College Press, 1934), 23; Patricia Schmuck, "Deterrents to Women's Careers in School Management, Sex Roles, 1 (1975), 339-53.

37. Committee on Equal Opportunity, National Education Association, Pertinent Problems of Equal Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941), 7; Howard K. Beale Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936).

38. Davis and Samuelson, "Women in Education," 32; Davis, "Women's Professional Problems," 15; McManis, Young, ch. 1; Norris Hundley, Jr., Notable American Women, Edward T. James, ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), vol. I, pp. 506-508. Gross and Trask, Men and Women, Susan Paddock, "Careers in Educational Administration: Are Women the Exception?" paper prepared for Sex Equity in Educational Leadership Project, University of Oregon, 1978, 4; for a perceptive linkage of family constraints to other barriers, see Sari Kopp Biklen, "Introduction: Barriers to Equity--Women, Educational Leadership, and Social Change," in Biklen and Brannigan, Women and Educational Leadership, 1-23.

39. Ward S. Mason, The Beginning Teacher (U.S. Office of Education, Circular No. 644, 1961; Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1961), ch. 10.

40. Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 94-95, 98-99, 101-6; for a discussion of male teachers taking on a "he-man" role, see Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley, 1967; orig. ed. 1932), 421; for a polemical and foolish attack on "feminization"--one in a long tradition--see Redding S. Sugg, Jr., Motherteacher: The Feminization of American Education (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1978).

41. Robert L. Rose, "Career Sponsorship in the School Superintendency," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969, 71-73, 75-76, 81.

42. Connolly, "Room at the Top?" 841.

43. Schmid, "Organizational Structure," chs. 5-6; Upton Sinclair, The Goslings: A Study of the American Schools (Pasadena, Ca.: The Author, 1924), ch. 54; Lorraine McDonnell, "The Control of Political Change Within an Interest Group: The Case of the National Education Association," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1975, ch. 1.

44. Connolly, "Room at the Top?" 841.

45. Michael W. Kirst and Walter I. Garms, The Demographic, Fiscal and Political Environment of Public School Finance in the 1980's (Stanford, Ca.: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, 1980), 1-38.

46. Lorraine Collins, "About Those Few Females Who Scale the Heights of School Management," American School Board Journal, 163 (1976), 27; Albert O. Hirschman, Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970); Lewis Mayhew, Educational Leadership and Declining Enrollments (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1974); Charles D. Moody, "The Black Superintendent," School Review, 81 (1973), 375-82; Rosie Doughty, "The Black Female Daministrator: Woman in a Double Bind," in Biklen and Brannigan, Woman and Educational Leadership, 165-73.

47. Landon, "Perceptions of Sex Role Stereotyping," Appendix E, 190.

48. Alvenia L. Scriven and Michael Y. Nunnery, "Women Central Office Administrators in Large Districts: Characteristics and Perceptions," Educational Horizons, 52 (1974), 138-41; Jean D. Grambs, "Women and Administration: Confrontation or Accomodation?" Theory Into Practice, 15 (1976), 293-300.

49. American Association of School Administrators, Sex Equality in Educational Administration (Arlington, Va.: AASA, 1975); David Coursen, Women and Minorities in Administration (School Leadership Digest series; Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1975); Patricia Palmieri and Charol Smith Shakeshaft, "Up the Front Staircase: A Proposal for Women to Achieve Equity with Men in the Field of Educational Administration," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 39 (1976), 58-65; R. Susan Gordon and Patricia G. Ball, "Survival Dynamics for Women in Educational Administration," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 40 (1977), 46-48.

50. Linda Keller Brown, "Women and Business Management," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 5 (1979), 282-83; Louise Bach makes a case for women using different strategies than men in "Of Women, School Administration, and Discipline," Phi Delta Kappan, 57 (1976), 463-66.

51. Virginia E. O'Leary, "Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occupational Aspirations in Women," Psychological Bulletin, 81 (1974), 809-26.

52. Barbara Sinclair Deckard, The Women's Movement: Political Socioeconomic, and Psychological Issues (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), chs. 12-13.

53. Kanter, Men and Women, part 3.

54. John Stuart Mill, "The Subjection of Women," in Three Essays (New York: Oxford Press, 1975), 439; Jo Freeman, "The Women's Liberation Movement: Its Origins, Organizations, Activities, and Ideas," in Freeman, ed., Women: A Feminist Perspective (Palo Alto, Ca.: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1979), 561.